Why McCarthy May Be Our Last Chance, Page 3

The One Word Manifesto of The Poor

"I can still remember John L. Lewis's answer [when he was asked what labor wanted]. In one of his testier moments he said, 'Labor wants more. I will spell it out for you—M-O-R-E.' I can't really improve on that. That's what the poor people want. We want M-O-R-E."

—Rev. Ralph David Abernathy at the National Press Club in Washington, June 15, chiding newsmen for constantly asking what were the aims of the Poor People's March, though it has issued a 50-page list of proposals, outlining specific steps to end hunger and poverty.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Now Published Bi-Weekly

VOL. XVI, NO. 13 JUNE 24, 1968 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

Spiking the Little Guns But Not the Big

Of course there were genuine elements in the mourning over the assassination of Robert F. Kennedy. Most people are decent, when the issues do not become too distant or abstract to elude their sympathy. Here the elements were simple: a widowed wife, fatherless children and an earnest young man; imbued, amid the other mixed motives that move all of us, with more than average idealism; promising a great potential for leadership. But mixed with the grief were other elements with roots as old in the makeup of mankind: superstition and a desire to appease the dead, especially on the part of those who disliked him; the ancient feeling about the blood sacrifice, which runs deep in all religions, and especially in the worship of a Crucified God and a Sacrificed Son. There was also love of pageantry, particularly in funerals, which brought out the crowds, along the railroad route to Washington, and the viewers before the television machines. Violence is their most popular fare and the second Kennedy assassination, like the first, provided TV with a wondrous opportunity to exploit violence in the very act piously of deploring it. The main element here was the Spectacle, spiced by a sense of guilt, fed by all those sermons, clerical and journalistic, on how wickedly violent we Americans are. Vicariously, as in those Westerns, but with a greater immediacy, people had a fine sense of released aggression and cleansing contrition, the *catharsis* Aristotle prized in tragic poetry.

Where Gun Control Should Begin

We dwell astringently on these unsavory aspects people prefer to hide because we would like to see the shock of the crime, following so soon after the killing of our greatest Negro leader, harnessed to purposes that match the real moral dimensions. The emphasis on gun control, which we of course approve, strikes us as a prime example of how easily people can be led to miss the point. If we indeed value human life, if we want to see bloodshed ended, then the gun control should begin in Vietnam and at the Pentagon. If the President's expressions of concern were more than conventional humbug, he had the power to show it by some signal act, like an end to all bombing in North Vietnam, or a unilateral cease-fire accompanied by a plea to the enemy to follow suit. This would indeed set an example of non-violence and show the world that America had the will to set a new course. For the United States and its President are today the world's largest practitioners of violence.

Granted that in the terrible civil war in Vietnam, crimes are not confined to one side, but our contribution, and Johnson's contribution, in sheer, impersonal, mechanical and automated slaughter, by bomb, napalm and devilish "anti-personnel" devices transcend all else and are threatening to annihilate a nation and make a whole area unlivable, even for the innocent beasts of the jungle. To greet the occasion with the appointment of another typical stuffed shirt Establishment commission to regulate control of hand guns and rifles at home is revolting. Of course, as a President, Johnson feels deeply about an unregulated gun traffic that is a threat to the lives of Presidents and Presidential contenders. But what of the bigger violence into which he would thrust some of the best of our youth? How does the fanaticism which fired the deaths of King and Kennedy differ from the stubborn fanaticism which leads Johnson to go on with the killing in Viet-

(*Continued on Page Two*)

Why We Hope For A Spock Trial Reversal

Unless peace talks break down and the war escalates after the election, Dr. Spock and his three convicted anti-war colleagues will—we believe—win reversal on appeal. The Judge's instructions to the jury, like his incautious prediction in the corridors that all would be convicted, were themselves prejudicial. So was his unusual action in issuing a questionnaire to the jury on each subdivision of the one count conspiracy indictment. So was the odd way juries are picked in Boston. The main key to reversal is the conspiracy count itself. As Dr. Spock's counsel, Leonard Boudin asked the jury, how could the Call to Resist—a public political tract—be equated with a conspiracy, especially when many of the supposed conspirators did not meet until after their indictment? If five can be prosecuted, how about the other 2500 signers? What of Bishop Pike and Linus Pauling? Can such signatures be regarded as criminal intent? In conspiracy, agreement can be informal, it can be oral, it can be implied, Boudin argued, but there has to be some element of the consentual. He said the case should be called the Search for The Missing Agreement. If such expressions of opinion can be treated as conspiracy, what happens to the First Amendment?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*Continued from Page One*)

nam? How can we expect to cut down racial and political violence at home when we train our youth for it abroad?

The Duty of The Kennedy Clan

It is not Johnson alone whom we have the right to ask for evidence that the words they used in mourning are more than smug rubbish. We also have a right to ask it of Teddy Kennedy and the Kennedy clan. Robert Kennedy before he was killed was asking for a unified effort by the peace forces so that the American people could have a real choice next November. He regretted that he had listened to advisers like Sorenson and let McCarthy take the initiative on peace. The finest memorial Teddy and the Kennedy clan could erect to Bobby, the best way to show our best youth it was too harsh in condemning his indecision, would be to throw their vast political, human and financial resources behind McCarthy and the peace movement. To do otherwise is to downgrade Bobby's last brave stand. This is particularly true if Teddy accepts what Bobby firmly declined, second place on the Humphrey ticket. Bobby felt strongly that 10 consecutive primaries had shown that he and McCarthy, by piling up from 70 to 88 percent of the vote, spoke for the grass roots and the party's rank-and-file against the party machines. He wanted unification of the peace forces. His family ought to make good on those last wishes. We could not help but notice the symbolism in the appearance—at the family's request—of four Green Berets from the John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center (as it was renamed after *his* death) at Fort Bragg in the vigil at St. Patrick's. For in all the uproar about violence these Green Berets represent to the colonial countries a counter-revolutionary force, a menace to the aspirations of the poor in the underdeveloped world, a bulwark (for all their liberal rhetoric) of the oligarchy. These, to put it plainly, are the trained assassins of the Pax Americana, the de luxe arm of the rich man's war we wage in the poorer regions of the earth. We do not think their appearance at St. Patrick's comports with the deeper understanding in John F. Kennedy's last year as President nor with the direction in which Bobby Kennedy was developing. Nothing could do more to wipe out the unpleasant implications of the Green Berets at the bier than if Teddy were resolutely to pick up the fight for peace where his brother left off, and take second place on McCarthy's ticket, not Humphrey's.

Bold New Policies Dept.

Q. Did you say that we ought to broaden the base of representation in the Vietnamese Government?

A. Right.

Q. Are you talking about bringing in the Viet Cong, or the National Liberation Front?

A. No. I said democratic elements, and I do not consider the Viet Cong as a democratic element.

—U. S. News & World Report *interview with Rockefeller, June 24.*

Of course Humphrey is getting ready to readjust his image again. Bill Moyers has forecast a shift. But we have as little faith in any maneuver by Humphrey toward the peace movement as we have in Rockefeller's multi-million dollar campaign of demagogic advertising on that and the race issue. If Humphrey's past position on Vietnam was mere loyalty to Johnson, why did he find it necessary almost two months after Johnson's withdrawal from the race to tell *U.S. News & World Report* (May 27), "If Nixon and Humphrey should be the candidates in the general election. I don't think our views of the war would be too far apart"?

Johnson has been wooing Moscow with the carrot, Nixon has hinted he would use the club. That is a difference one would have thought Humphrey would emphasize. Why, instead, did he go out of his way to cuddle up to Nixon, as he is getting ready now to cuddle up to the peace forces?

Of course we are for gun control. We see it as another instance of how powerful interest lobbies dominate the government and are allowed to profit from killing. In this the gun lobby is like the cigarette lobby, which spreads its advertising on TV unhindered despite all the findings about lung cancer, or like the military-industrial complex, which fattens on the billions spent for the development of ever more terrifying means of mass production. But we see the gun control uproar as a way to deflect attention from the more fundamental problems of the Big Gun lobby. Though we have resisted the conspiracy theory in the killing of John F. Kennedy, we believe enough has come to light clearly to show a conspiracy in the killing of Martin Luther King and very possibly of Robert Kennedy. A well-heeled crowd of white supremacists will not be deterred by gun control from the murder of other black leaders. Kennedy was killed by a hand gun but if Sirhan had associates they could easily have eluded gun con-

Cooper Opens A Bi-Partisan Attack On A $5 To $40 Billion Folly

"First, let us examine the 'threat' against which the Sentinel ABM is designed—the threat of Communist China. We must ask as reasonable persons if it is likely that Communist China would assure its own destruction by a nuclear attack on the United States.

"Both the United States and the Soviet Union have the nuclear capability many times over to destroy each other and we have been assured that the United States would have the capability even after a first strike by the Soviet Union. An ABM defense system—"thin" or "heavy"—designed for protection against the Soviet Union would not alter this ability to completely destroy each other. It would, in fact, only accelerate the arms race.

"The history of missile technology is that offensive technology will always out-distance defensive efforts. Had Nike-Zeus been deployed, for example, it would have been obsolete before completion. The Sentinel system now planned for deployment may become quickly obsolete. It is not designed to defend against MIRV (missile with multiple warheads and independently targeted).

"The United States cannot afford at this time to spend money on a system costing 5 to 7 billion dollars, which may be extended to a heavier system costing 40 billion or more, unless it is essential to our security. We have hopefully learned a hard lesson from Vietnam. We did not rigorously consider the implications of our increasing involvement in Vietnam when it was possible to extricate ourselves with relatively small loss and at a time, and in such a way that might have furthered the opportunity for self-determination and peace in South Vietnam. We dare not fail to look at the implications of the deployment of the ABM."

—*Cooper* (R.-Ky.) *in the Senate, June 13 (abr.)*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trol. The essence is not gun control but hate control.

This is not an argument against gun control; there are far too many guns around. But gun control will not prevent insurrection unless we end the frustration in the ghetto and the settlement of inter-human disputes by force, as in the Palestine conflict which Sirhan reflected, and above all in Vietnam. If we have no choice in November but Humphrey or Nixon—especially if Humphrey is accompanied by a Teddy Kennedy sellout—then the nihilistic anger will deepen. Events everywhere have shown that tiny groups of revolutionaries can polarize whole campuses and countries when a malaise of this kind grows.

McCarthy Is Our Last Chance

Only McCarthy offers a way to escape, a way to make democratic processes meaningful again, a way to preserve peace at home by moving swiftly toward it in Vietnam. He has grown, his campaign has deepened, his appeal has widened. All of us professional dopesters and commentators—myself included—have underestimated him. No man has been counted out more often; no man has made the polls and the political consensus look sillier more often. We think he has a fighting chance, if we all close ranks behind him.

His speech to the Fellowship of Reconciliation in New York June 13 was one of his finest. It struck a new note when it said that in Vietnam we must end the war "under conditions which do justice not only to our honor but to the honor of our opponents, and most of all to the common wish to live and to rebuild." This recalls de Gaulle's call to the Algerian rebels for "a peace of the brave" with honor to both sides. He called—as the next step—to a liquidation of the cold war atmosphere and an arms reduction agreement with the Soviet Union to lift the menace of thermonuclear war. He called for an end to the world policeman role and to letting American policy be made—tail-wag-the-dog style—"by small and often undemocratic governments who get out support only by their claim to be anti-Communist."

McCarthy may be our last chance for peace. We do not know what will happen after the election. There are ominous signs. There are indications that the conviction of Dr. Spock and three associates is but the beginning of a whole series of prosecutions intended to break resistance to war and intimidate the peace movement. Why the further prosecutions in the works if the Johnson Administration really looks toward peace? They serve a political purpose only if the war is to escalate again, and some way must be found in advance to prevent effective protest.

There is another factor which makes redoubled efforts for McCarthy urgent. There are signs that the Johnson Administration at Paris has upped the price for a complete cessation of the bombing in the North. At one time its position was that we would only stop the bombing if we were sure talks would follow. Talks are on now. The San Antonio formula and the Clifford explanation was that we would end the bombing totally if we could assume that the enemy would not afterward raise the level of supplies and reinforcements into the South. But now it seems that Harriman is asking that Hanoi agree to shut off aid to the south altogether before we will end the bombing. This, it appears, is the real meaning of Harriman's emphasis on restoring the DMZ and enforcing the 1962 Laotian agreement. The first would end all move-

(*Continued on Page Four*)

How the Viet Cong Use Our Firepower

"It's of really no military consequence. It does make headlines, I must say."

—Westmoreland on the VC shelling of Saigon, Washington Star, *June 11.*

"In fact, the Viet Cong have discovered a way—the discovery was made accidentally during the Tet offensive—of using the American firepower against them. For the loss of a dozen or so brave men the Viet Cong can rely on showing up the weakness and indiscipline of the South Vietnamese Government troops and they can count on a whole suburb being destroyed in the process. With the showers of rockets and mortar shells every night they hope that an overwhelming demand will be built up that Saigon should be evacuated, especially women and children—but where to? If Saigon is not safe nowhere in South Vietnam is safe."

—Murray Sayle, London Sunday Times, *June 9.*

A Brave Civil Rights Commission Report Timed to Help The Poor Peoples March

"The South has been exporting its problems North. Many of the unemployed, frustrated, hopeless people of the cities are migrants from rural areas, who have left behind other unemployed, frustrated and hopeless people . . . [G]overnment is not intervening effectively at any point to provide people who have been victims of slavery and discrimination with an opportunity to lead decent and productive lives. . . . Government policy is not making it possible for him to stay on the land or work in the towns of the area, it is not equipping him with the education and skill which will enable him to survive in the big city or to obtain a job once he gets there, and it is not providing any place else for him to go. . . .

"The total economic dependence of black people is not confined to the argricultural sector of the economy. Even when family income is from nonfarm employment, extensive underemployment and seasonal employment requires that families seek credit from others in order to survive. The Commission heard testimony about Bellamy, Alabama, a company town owned by the American Can Company and the site of one of their large sawmill operations. Frank Fenderson, an employee, who lives at Bellamy, testified that his total take home pay for two weeks' work, after deduction for taxes, rent and debts owed to the company store, was five dollars. . . [W]hen government programs fail to reach people they remain dependent upon their old masters —the plantation owner, the furnishing merchant, the bossman. . . .

"Companies holding millions of dollars of government contracts and required to take steps to provide equal opportunity engage in blatant discrimination. For example, the American Can Company is a government contractor. Its Company town, Bellamy, is totally segregated. Only four black homes have running water and inside toilet facilities; every white house has running water and inside toilet facilities. . . . Before the economic bondage which exists in Alabama can be ended it will be necessary to develop programs to assure every family a standard of living adequate to provide at least a reasonable chance in life. . . [But] it is not enough merely to shift the focus of dependency from a plantation owner to a government agency. People must be given some measure of influence or control over programs and decisions which affect them. . . .

—William L. Taylor, Staff Director U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, June 14, reporting on Alabama.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Indications That We Are Stiffening Our Terms In Paris

(*Continued from Page Three*)

ment across the zone; the second would shut off the so-called Ho Chi Minh trail in Eastern Laos.

This means that the price is still surrender and that we still hope to use the bombing of the North to end the war in the South. This is beginning to leak out of briefings in Paris (see Thomas Fenton's backgrounder from Paris in the Perspective section of the *Baltimore Sun,* Sunday, June 16) and out of briefings in Washington. One such was reflected in an unsigned piece on the opposite editorial page of the *Washington Post,* June 15, which said "This double request is acknowledged to be *perhaps a bit more* [our italics] than the assumption in President Johnson's San Antonio formula." We managed to check this out with one official, but only on a not for attribution basis. The explanation given was that in asking a shutoff of both the DMZ and the Ho Chi Minh trail Harriman was only making "proposals" for reciprocal moves which would lead us to end the bombing, not setting "conditions" for doing so!

A Distinction Without A Difference

This seems to us a distinction without a difference. It must stiffen the other side to arrive in Paris and find that we have upped our terms—whether as "proposals" or "conditions"—for a complete cessation of the bombing. This strengthens the evidence reported in our last issue (1) that Harriman on the eve of Paris showed no readiness for any political compromise and (2) that Johnson's real strategy is to defuse the peace movement during the campaign by the talks and the limited cessation. After the election, whether the victor be Humphrey or Nixon, the essential Johnson policy can be continued of striving to restore an "independent" South Vietnam under our wing.

We still believe a major factor in limiting the bombing was to end the extraordinarily high cost, in planes and pilots, of the raids on heavily defended Hanoi and Haiphong. World War II experience showed air raids most effective not as a terror weapon—Mary McCarthy's magnificent series from Hanoi in the *New York Review of Books* shows bombing has only inspired greater resistance—but as a means of attacking transportation routes. We have increased the number and intensity of our air raids but limited them to the transportation lines of the panhandle. "Admiral Cagle's pilots claim," Keyes Beech of the *Chicago Daily News* reported from the nuclear powered flagship USS Enterprise in the Tonkin Gulf (*Washington Post,* June 15) "that they are doing a more effective job of disrupting Communist supply lines to South Vietnam by concentrating on a smaller target area than before President Johnson imposed the bombing limitation on March 31." The Rear Admiral himself told Beech, "From a purely tactical military viewpoint I see no point in resuming the bombing, under the same target restrictions."

Even Johnson only claims that we are destroying 20 percent of the shipments. Our guess would be that this 20 percent increase in costs to the enemy (if Johnson's estimate, unlike our other war claims, are not exaggerated) is paid for many times over in the costs to us of the bombardment. Some day the whole truth will be known, and we suspect the disparity in costs will prove to be enormous. In the meantime it is not cutting down the pace of the war in the South nor our casualties. Its only effect is political, to disarm the peace movement. Peace now depends on reawakening the peace movement and on the toppling of the Saigon regime under Viet Cong attacks. It is there that the issue will be decided.

Saigon's Failing Grip

"With enemy forces entrenched on all sides of South Vietnam's capital and less than 20 percent of its territory under the Government's undisputed control, it is difficult to imagine how the Government can end the war without talking with the enemy. More and more government officials at the highest level recognize this in private. . . . Today [Dr. Phan Quang] Dan [dismissed as Minister of State for saying in the U. S. last week that since Saigon cannot kill off all the Viet Cong it will have to end up by talking to them] is regarded as having said too soon what many Vietnamese regard as inevitable."

—*AP from Saigon in* Baltimore Sun, *June 17.*

If You Enjoyed Stone's New Book, You Might Like A Copy of His Earlier Collection, "The Haunted Fifties" Out of Print in This Country—A Few Copies of The English Edition Are Now Available at The Original Cut Price of $4.95

FOR STONE'S NEW BOOK

For the enclosed $6.95 send I. F. Stone's new book, In A Time of Torment (Random House) regular price $7.95

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

I. F. Stone's Weekly 6/24/68

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. 20015

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every other Monday at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $17 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED